

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 223 941

CG 016 350

AUTHOR Drummond, Robert J.
TITLE Reality Therapy at the Maine Youth Center: Assessment of Youth. Interim Report
SPONS AGENCY Maine Univ., Orono. Coll. of Education.
PUB DATE 81
NOTE 75p.; For related document, see CG 016 322.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adolescents; Correctional Education; *Correctional Institutions; *Institutionalized Persons; Institutional Research; *Rehabilitation Programs; Secondary Education; Self Actualization; Self Evaluation (Groups); *Youth Problems; *Youth Programs

IDENTIFIERS *Maine Youth Center; *Reality Therapy

ABSTRACT

Reality Therapy is a system which stresses that individuals are responsible for their own behavior, and that excuses based on environment, heredity, or the past are not acceptable as explanations for behavior. To assess the impact of training in Reality Therapy on youth at the Maine Youth Center, subjects (all students at the Center) were asked to complete five to seven instruments, e.g., a demographic data sheet, the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory, and the Jesness Behavior Checklist, three different times at 6-month intervals. Subjects' responses on each instrument were entered in a data set and scored. Findings about the impact of the program on the youth, rather than on the staff, revealed that: (1) the youth were attempting to follow the steps of Reality Therapy; (2) youth tended to show a much higher need and desire for affection; (3) youths' perceptions of the correction environment changed positively over time; (4) the youths should be tested within weeks of arrival, followed up on 5 months later, and tracked after their release; (5) significant sex differences existed on several of the instruments utilized, and therefore separate analyses should be done for males and females; and (6) an evaluation should be done on the effect of Reality Therapy on the school unit. (PAS)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED223941

REALITY THERAPY
AT THE MAINE YOUTH CENTER:
ASSESSMENT OF YOUTH

An Interim Report
1981

Robert J. Drummond
Evaluator
University of Maine Teacher
Corps Project

CE 016350

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

* Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robert J. Drummond
UMC Teacher Corps

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	PAGE 1
PROCEDURES	3
THE INSTRUMENTS	4
DATA ANALYSIS	5
THE POPULATION	5
RESULTS	14
TREND ANALYSIS	14
COTTAGE DIFFERENCES	19
STAFF RATINGS COMPARED WITH YOUTH RATINGS	43
LEVEL OF IMPLEMENTATION	49
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	56
RECOMMENDATIONS	59

FORWARD

The purpose of this study was to assess the impact of training in Reality therapy on the youth at the Maine Youth Center. The training program was a part of the University of Maine Teacher Corps project in youth advocacy. This is an interim report of the results of the May 1981 assessment of youth and is one of a series of reports on the impact of Reality therapy at the Maine Youth Center.

The Maine Youth Center was established to rehabilitate children committed thereto as juvenile offenders by the courts of the state. The Center utilizes education, casework, group processess, psychology, psychiatry, medicine, nursing, vocational training and religion in order to help in the rehabilitation of youth. The primary mode of treatment or treatment philosophy adopted was Reality Therapy (Glasser, 1965).

Reality Therapy is a system which stresses that individuals are responsible for their own behavior. Excuses are not accepted for behavior such as the environment, heredity or the past. The individual is directed to look at the present not the past. Reality therapy is a method which helps persons develop confidence to handle responsibly the stresses and problems of life.

The system is designed to enhance the self confidence of the clients through the caring relationship of others. When individuals believe that others care about them, they can begin to build self confidence in themselves which in turn helps them fulfill their basic human needs.

Reality therapy stresses that everyone has to take the responsibility to look at what they want, at what they are doing and then evaluate their behavior in terms of what they want. They are then guided to make a plan to get what they want.

The youth are helped by the staff to apply through the eight steps of Reality Therapy. These are:

1. Make friends. Ask what do you want?
2. What are you doing now?
3. Ask: Is it helping?

4. Make a plan to do better.
5. Get a commitment.
6. Do not accept excuses.
7. Do not punish but do not interfere with reasonable consequences.
8. Never give up.

PROCEDURES

This section contains a description of the evaluation design, the instruments used, the procedures, and the data analyses selected.

DESIGN

A modified time series design was utilized. The youth were to be assessed approximately at six month intervals. Three major assessments have now been completed. The first was conducted during January of 1980. The second was completed during May of 1980 and the third during May of 1981. Two other assessments were conducted involving either one specific instrument or subgroup from the total population. The intent of the design was to assess the youth at different implementation stages of Reality therapy within the Maine Youth Center.

PROCEDURES

First of all the training procedures are briefly introduced and then the assessment procedures are discussed. The training program set up was a Double T model. A trainer, experienced in reality therapy, was hired initially to train a core of staff who then train additional staff members. These trainers participated in the certification training program conducted by the Reality

Therapy Institute in California. (A more detailed description of the training program can be found in Reality Therapy in Juvenile Corrections: A Staff Development Program by Mehnert, I. and Barnard, L., 1980). Teachers, cottage treatment staff as well as business and support staff were involved in the training.

The assessment instruments were administered to the youth by the director of psychological services and the director of cottage treatment services or staff members trained by these individuals. The examiners explained the purpose of the tests, the importance of the assessment and monitored the testing to see that the forms were being properly and seriously completed.

INSTRUMENTS

The youth were asked to complete five to seven instruments each testing period. Some of the instruments were not given each testing period but are rotated every other period. The instruments administered were:

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. A demographic data sheet | Asks questions about age, sex, educational level, length of stay at the Maine Youth Center. |
| 2. Reality Therapy Activities Questionnaire (Drummond, 1980) | Includes the eight dimensions of reality therapy which have to be rated as to frequency of use by the youth. |
| 3. Nowicki-Strickland (1972) Personal Reaction Survey (short form) | Contains 21 YES/NO statements measuring the locus of control, the degree of internal or external orientation of the respondents. |
| 4. Coopersmith (1967) Self-esteem Inventory (short form) | Contains 25 items which are answered LIKE ME/UNLIKE ME covering the topics of peers, parents, school and self. |

5. Correctional Institution Environment Scale (Moos, 1976)

Contains 36 TRUE/FALSE statements in the short form and 90 in the long form measuring nine dimensions of the social psychological environment of the correctional institution such as: Involvement, Support, Expressiveness, Autonomy, Practical Orientation, Personal Problem Orientation, Order and Organization, Clarity, and Staff Control.

6. Firo-B (Schutz, 1977)

Has 54 items in which individuals are asked to respond on a 6 point Guttman scale NEVER to USUALLY or NOBODY to MOST PEOPLE and assesses the subject's behavior on three dimensions: inclusion or the individuals need to have good or positive relationships and interactions with others; control or the behavior of decision making between individuals; and affection, the subject's need for loving and affectionate relationships with others.

7. The Jesness Behavior Checklist (1970)

Consists of 80 items rated from ALMOST NEVER to VERY OFTEN measuring 14 bipolar behavior factors such as Unobtrusiveness vs. Obtrusiveness, Friendliness vs. Hostility, Responsibility vs. Irresponsibility, Considerateness vs. Inconsiderateness, Independence vs. Dependence, Rapport vs. Alienation, Enthusiasm vs. Depression, Sociability vs. Poor Peer Relations, Conformity vs. Non-conformity, Calmness vs. Anxiousness, Effective Communications vs. Inarticulateness, Insight vs. Unawareness, Social Control vs. Attention Seeking, Anger Control vs. Noncontrol.

8. The Sixteen Personal
Factor Questionnaire
(Form E) (Cattell, 1967)

Measures 16 dimensions of personality such as Reserved-Outgoing, Affected by Feelings-Emotionally Stable, Humble-Assertive, Sober-Happy go lucky, Expedient-Conscientious, Shy-Venturesome, Tough-minded-Tender-minded, Trusting-Suspicious, Practical-Imaginative, Forthright-Shrewd, Self-assured-Apprehensive, Conservative-Experimenting, Group-dependent-Self-sufficient, Relaxed-Tense, Undisciplined self-conflict-Controlled, Less Intelligent-More Intelligent.

The May 1981 assessment utilized all the instruments listed except for the Sixteen Personal Factor Questionnaire.

DATA

ANALYSIS

The responses of the subjects on each instrument were entered in a data set and scored utilizing the computational features of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (Nie, 1975). The names of individuals were coded prior to analysis. Frequencies were computed for items, subscores, and total scores for each of the scales. Comparisons were made by cottage. Analysis of variance was computed to test differences among the mean scores by cottage.

POPULATION

An attempt was made to assess the total group of residents at each testing time. The breakdown by cottage is presented in Table 1. One hundred ninety-nine youth completed the assessment in May 1981. The age distribution is reported in Table 2. The median age across all three assessments is 16. The mean age ranges from 15.90 in January 1980 to 16.03 in May 1980.

TABLE 2
COMPARISON OF THE JANUARY 1980
MAY 1980, MAY 1981
MAINE YOUTH CENTER POPULATION BY AGE

AGE	1980 JANUARY		1980 MAY		1981 MAY	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
	(174)		(181)		(199)	
18	14	7.9	13	7.2	5	2.5
17	47	26.8	66	36.5	64	32.2
16	58	33.1	48	26.5	73	36.7
15	27	15.5	34	18.8	34	17.1
14	20	11.5	12	6.6	18	9.0
13	6	3.4	5	2.8	4	2.0
12	2	1.1	2	1.1	1	0.5
11	0	0.0	1	0.6		
MEAN 15.90			16.03		15.94	
MODE 16.00			17.00		16.00	
MEDIAN 16.05			16.26		16.08	

TABLE 3

COMPARISON OF THE JANUARY 1980, May 1980, May 1981
MAINE YOUTH CENTER POPULATION BY SEX

SEX	JANUARY 1980		MAY 1980		MAY 1981	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
FEMALE	19	11.0	23	12.7	16	8.0
MALE	155	89.0	158	87.3	175	87.9
MISSING					8	4.0
N =	174		181			

TABLE 4
COMPARISON OF THE JANUARY 1980 AND MAY 1980
MAINE YOUTH CENTER POPULATION BY LAST
GRADE COMPLETED

GRADE	JANUARY		MAY 1980		MAY 1981	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
12	1	0.6	6	3.3		
11	8	4.6	4	2.2	7	3.5
10	38	21.8	33	17.9	28	14.1
9	47	27.8	45	24.5	54	27.1
8	50	28.7	57	31.0	66	33.2
7	21	12.1	21	11.4	25	12.6
6	6	3.4	7	3.8	11	5.5
5 (or under)	2	1.2	7	3.8	4	2.0
(missing)	1	0.6	4	2.2	4	2.0
MEAN	8.63		8.51		8.51	
MODE	8.00		8.00		8.00	
MEDIAN	8.66		8.46		8.36	

About seven-eighths of the group were males on all three assessments and eight females. The sex distribution is given in Table 3. The distribution of the last grade completed before incarceration is listed in Table 4. The typical youth at the center has completed at least eight years of school.

The length of stay of the youth at the time of testing is compared in Table 5. The mean length of stay at testing time in all three periods was 6 months; the median, 4. The mode varied from 5 to 8 weeks to 4 months.

The youth were asked to check their educational and career aspirations when they are released on the demographic data sheet. There was a shift in aspirations of the 1980 groups compared to the 1981 group. The number of youth saying that they wish to complete high school declined from 53.4 percent in January of 1980 to 35.7 percent in May of 1981. The number checking get a job rose from 27.0 percent in January 1980 to 44.7 percent in May 1981. Fewer students tend to be unsure, 6.3 percent in January 1980 to 3 percent in May 1981.

The youth were asked how many times they had been at the Maine Youth Center before now on the May 1981 form. The mean was 1.10, the mode 0, and the median 0.43.

TABLE 5
 LENGTH OF STAY AT DATE OF TESTING
 FOR JANUARY 1980 AND MAY 1980
 MAINE YOUTH CENTER POPULATION

LENGTH OF STAY	JANUARY		MAY		MAY (1981)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Less than 2 weeks	8	4.6	19	10.5	12	6.0
2-4 weeks	13	7.5	10	5.5	20	10.1
5-8 weeks	23	13.2	19	10.5	31	15.6
3 months	22	12.6	17	9.4	35	17.6
4 months	9	5.2	26	14.4	19	9.5
5 months	23	13.2	18	9.9	15	7.5
6 months	10	5.7	6	3.3	7	3.5
7 months	5	2.9	8	4.4	9	4.5
8 months	9	5.2	9	5.0	7	3.5
9 months	4	2.3	9	5.0	9	4.5
10 months	5	2.9	7	3.9	2	1.0
11 months	5	2.9	3	1.7	3	1.5
1½ years	15	8.6	12	6.6	7	3.5
1½-2 years	7	4.0	10	5.5	12	6.0
More than 2 years	8	4.6	8	4.4	7	3.5
Missing	8	4.6	0	0.0	4	2.0
MODE	5-8 weeks/5 months		4 months		3 months	
MEDIAN	4 months		4 months		4 months	
MEAN	6 months		6 months		6 months	

TABLE 6

EDUCATIONAL AND CAREER ASPIRATIONS OF THE JANUARY 1980, MAY 1980,
AND MAY 1981 MAINE YOUTH CENTER POPULATION

CATEGORY	JANUARY 1980		MAY 1980		MAY 1981	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
FINISH HIGH SCHOOL	93	53.4	82	44.6	71	35.7
GET A JOB	47	27.0	66	35.9	89	44.7
TRADE SCHOOL	23	13.2	20	10.9	29	14.6
DON'T KNOW	11	6.3	10	5.4	6	3.0
(Missing)	0	0.0	6	3.3	4	2.0

TABLE 7
 Times at Maine Youth Center
 (May 1981 sample)

Times	f	%
0	107	53.8
1	47	23.6
2	18	9.0
3	14	7.0
4	3	1.5
5	3	1.5
6	4	2.0
7 or over	3	1.5

Mean	1.095
Mode	0.0
SD	2.19
Median	0.43

RESULTS

14.

The section is divided into four parts. First the responses on each instrument are compared across each testing period. Secondly, cottage differences are presented on the May 1981 testing. Thirdly, staff ratings are compared with youth ratings. Fourthly, comparisons are compared against levels of implementation.

TREND ANALYSIS

The youth completed some of the instruments in each of the three testing periods and some in just two of the periods. All the students completed the Reality Therapy Activities Questionnaire. The comparison of responses by testing period is given in Table 8. It should be noted that two items were added to the May 1980 form and subsequently used in May 1981 also. These were "understand and recognize my values" and "decide whether my values are right or wrong". The table includes for each item the number of youth who checked the category and the percent of the total group making this response. In general, the youth assessed in May 1981 tend to be utilizing the dimensions of Reality Therapy more, although there are not statistically significant differences, than youth assessed in May 1980 and January 1980. They tend, however, not to respond as intensely as the previous groups. More of the May 1980 group checked the category "all of the time" than the January 1980 or May 1981 groups.

Fewer May 1981 youth report that they never discuss their behavior with the staff. More of this group have checked the "most of the time" and "all of the time categories" than those in the previous assessments. None of the May 1981 group checked that they never decide whether their values are right or wrong.

TABLE 8

COMPARISON OF THE JANUARY 1980, MAY 1980, AND MAY 1981
RESPONSES ON THE REALITY THERAPY ACTIVITIES QUESTIONNAIRE
BY MAINE YOUTH CENTER POPULATION

ITEM	TIME	CATEGORY				
		NEVER	SELDOM	SOME OF THE TIME	MOST OF THE TIME	ALL OF THE TIME
DISCUSS BEHAVIOR WITH STAFF	J80	21	31	73	36	11
		12.2	18.0	42.4	20.9	6.4
	M80	14	27	87	39	12
		7.8	15.1	48.6	21.8	6.7
	M81	13	38	88	45	16
		6.5	18.9	43.8	22.4	8.0
DISCUSS BEHAVIOR WITH FRIENDS	J80	15	32	64	48	13
		8.7	18.6	37.2	27.9	7.6
	M80	15	24	62	51	27
		8.4	13.4	34.6	28.5	15.1
	M81	15	29	92	49	14
		7.5	14.4	45.8	24.4	7.0
EVALUATE MY BEHAVIOR	J80	14	21	51	49	13
		8.2	12.4	20.0	28.8	20.6
	M80	7	21	51	57	43
		3.9	11.7	28.5	31.8	24.0
	M81	16	29	66	56	30
		8.1	14.7	33.5	28.4	15.2
ACCEPT RESPON- SIBILITY FOR MY BEHAVIOR	J80	3	4	25	74	65
		1.8	2.3	14.6	43.3	38.0
	M80	3	5	33	67	71
		1.7	2.8	18.4	37.4	39.7
	M81	2	12	43	83	58
		1.0	6.1	21.7	41.9	29.3
ACCEPT RESPON- SIBILITY FOR MY DECISIONS	J80	4	12	27	54	74
		2.3	7.0	15.8	31.6	43.3
	M80	0	4	41	59	75
		0.0	2.2	22.9	33.0	41.9
	M81	1	9	45	74	69
		0.5	4.5	22.7	37.4	34.8

TABLE 8 (cont.)

ITEM	TIME	CATEGORY				
		NEVER	SELDOM	SOME OF THE TIME	MOST OF THE TIME	ALL OF THE TIME
MAKE EXCUSES FOR MY BEHAVIOR	J80	30	58	58	14	10
		17.6	34.1	34.1	8.2	5.9
	M80	38	66	53	12	8
		21.5	27.3	29.9	6.8	4.5
	M81	41	77	57	13	8
		20.9	39.3	29.1	6.6	4.1
MAKE PLANS FOR CHANGE I DO NOT COMPLETE	J80	31	41	59	24	16
		18.1	24.0	35.4	14.0	9.4
	M80	30	54	42	35	18
		16.8	30.2	23.5	19.6	10.1
	M81	23	53	70	34	18
		11.5	26.5	35.0	17.0	9.0
MAKE FRIENDS WITH PEERS	J80	2	6	20	77	67
		1.2	3.5	11.6	44.8	39.0
	M80	2	2	20	73	82
		1.1	1.1	11.2	40.8	45.8
	M81	5	7	24	82	81
		2.5	3.5	11.9	40.8	40.3
MAKE FRIENDS WITH STAFF	J80	9	8	26	70	59
		5.2	4.7	15.1	40.7	34.3
	M80	3	8	30	55	82
		1.7	4.5	16.9	30.9	46.1
	M81	2	16	34	68	78
		1.0	8.1	17.2	34.3	39.4
UNDERSTAND AND RECOGNIZE MY VALUES	J80	--	--	--	--	--
		--	--	--	--	--
	M80	6	7	41	69	41
		3.7	4.3	25.0	42.1	25.0
	M81	4	9	26	36	28
		3.9	8.7	25.2	35.0	27.2 (M=98)
DECIDE WHETHER VALUES ARE RIGHT OR WRONG	J80	--	--	--	--	--
		--	--	--	--	--
	M80	6	21	35	53	48
		3.7	12.9	21.5	32.5	29.4
	M81	0	9	33	35	23
		0.0	9.0	33.0	35.0	23.0

In terms of dimensions the 1981 group report utilized the most frequently are:

- 1) Making friends with peers
- 2) Making friends with staff
- 3) Accepting responsibility for my behavior
- 4) Accepting responsibilities for my decisions

The dimensions being implimented less than the others are:

- 1) Discuss behavior with the staff
- 2) Discuss behavior with friends
- 3) Making plans for change and keeping them

The youth at all three assessments completed the Jesness Behavior Rating Scale. The means and standard deviations for the three testings are presented in Table 9. There were no statistically significant differences between the scores by scale across time of testing. The scores from the January 1980 testing are more similar to the scores from the May 1981 testing.

The mean score on the Unobtrusive scale May 1980 was 31.34 as compared to 27.81, May 1981. Sociability was higher in May 1981 (18.41) than in May 1980, (15.21).

The Nowicki-Strickland Personal Reaction Scale was also administered each testing period. The test measures locus of control. The mean for the Jan 1980 testing was 6.36 (SD=3.75). The mean for May 1981 was 6.17 (SD=3.56) while the mean for May 1980 was 6.83 (SD=3.61). The test is scored in the direction of externality. There are a total of 20 items on the test. The score distributions are positively skewed. More of the groups tend to have internal types of orientation.

TABLE 9

COMPARISON OF THE JANUARY 1980, MAY 1980 AND MAY 1981
TESTINGS ON THE JESNESS BEHAVIOR RATING SCALE
FOR THE MAINE YOUTH CENTER POPULATION

SCALE	JANUARY 1980 MEAN (174) S.D.		MAY 1980 MEAN (181) S.D.		MAY 1981 MEAN(199) S.D.	
UNOBTRUSIVE	27.94	4.30	31.34	5.75	27.81	4.58
FRIENDLINESS	16.17	3.38	17.84	4.61	16.30	3.19
RESPONSIBILITY	34.52	4.57	34.17	7.47	34.40	4.79
CONSIDERATENESS	24.45	5.47	25.74	5.34	24.64	4.80
INDEPENDENCE	17.51	2.93	16.46	3.15	16.68	2.73
RAPPORT	17.81	4.38	18.06	4.02	18.04	4.16
ENTHUSIASM	16.69	2.99	17.86	3.62	16.75	3.18
SOCIABILITY	18.39	4.05	15.21	3.18	18.41	3.87
CONFORMITY	23.25	4.27	25.22	5.31	23.44	4.04
CALMNESS	19.89	4.05	21.02	4.27	19.36	4.67
COMMUNICATION	18.48	3.55	18.94	3.83	17.15	4.00
INSIGHT	24.16	4.42	23.02	4.87	23.88	5.39
SOCIAL CONTROL	15.63	3.12	15.26	2.99	15.51	2.99
ANGER CONTROL	14.26	3.62	14.29	3.22	14.16	3.41

The Coopersmith Self Esteem Inventory was administered in January 1980 and May of 1981. The score distributions and means and standard deviations are presented in Table 10. The mean for January 1980 was 17.95 while the mean for May 1981 was 17.46. There were no significant differences between the mean scores for the two testing periods.

The FIRO B was also administered in the same two time periods. The comparison of the two testings of the FIRO B in January of 1980 and May 1981 to the norms for high school populations given by Shultz are reported in Table 11. The score pattern of the youth on both assessments is basically the same. There are no statistically significant differences.

There are some marked differences between the high school norming group and the Maine Youth Center groups. The MYC group are higher in Expressed Control, Wanted Control and Wanted Affection. Control and Affection are higher for the MYC than the norming group of high school students.

COTTAGE DIFFERENCES (1980-1981)

A comparison of the differences by cottage on some of the instruments is presented in this section. It should be noted that there have been changes in the numbering of cottages. In the January 1980 sample the Security Unit was numbered Cottage 5 and the Hayden Unit, Cottage 9. The comparison of the previous to present numbering system is as follows:

TABLE 10

COMPARISON OF THE COOPERSMITH SELF ESTEEM SCORES
OF JANUARY 1980 AND MAY 1981 YOUTH
AT THE MAINE YOUTH CENTER

SCORE	JANUARY, 1980		MAY, 1981	
28	3	1.7	2	1.0
27	1	0.6	5	2.6
26	8	4.6	7	3.6
25	9	5.2	13	6.8
24	10	5.8	6	3.1
23	9	5.2	5	2.6
22	6	3.5	10	5.2
21	14	8.1	13	6.8
20	16	9.2	14	7.3
19	10	5.8	14	7.3
18	7	4.0	10	5.2
17	14	8.1	10	5.2
16	11	6.4	15	7.8
15	7	4.0	9	4.7
14	10	5.8	10	5.2
13	8	4.6	7	3.6
12	9	5.2	12	6.3
11	4	2.3	3	1.6
10	5	2.9	10	5.2
9	3	1.7	7	3.6
8	3	1.7	3	1.6
7	2	1.2	1	0.5
6	3	1.7	2	1.0
5	0	0.0	1	0.5
4	1	0.6	3	1.6
X	17.95		17.46	
MODE	20		16	
SD	6.15		5.63	

TABLE 11
MAINE YOUTH CENTER
COMPARISON OF RESPONSES OF THE FIRO B TO
NORMING GROUP OF SECONDARY STUDENTS

	FEMALE HS		MALE HS		JANUARY 1980		MYC	MAY 1981		(195)
	M	S.D.	M	S.D.	M	S.D.		M	S.D.	
EXPRESSED INCLUSION	4.9	1.99	4.1	2.27	4.40	2.27		4.49	2.10	
WANTED INCLUSION	4.9	3.44	4.0	3.22	4.35	3.31		4.20	3.28	
EXPRESSED CONTROL	1.9	1.81	2.7	2.28	2.37	2.14		2.64	2.23	
WANTED CONTROL	3.1	1.98	2.8	2.07	4.26	2.86		4.65	3.24	
EXPRESSED AFFECTION	4.4	2.64	3.3	2.27	3.52	2.31		3.53	2.12	
WANTED AFFECTION	5.0	2.54	3.6	2.49	8.29	2.10		8.06	2.00	
	M		M		M			M		
INCLUSION	9.8		8.1		8.75			8.69	4.63	
CONTROL	5.0		5.5		6.64			7.30	4.30	
AFFECTION	9.4		6.9		11.80			11.59	3.33	
TOTAL	24.2		20.5		27.19			27.57	8.67	
WANTED								16.91	5.72	

Previous

Present

1
2
3
4
5 STU
6
7
8 Girls
9 Hayden

1
8
3
4
2 STU
6
7
9 Girls
5 Hayden

The comparison of scores on the Coopersmith Self Esteem Inventory is presented in Table 12. Note the higher the score the more positive the individual's self-esteem.

Cottage 2 on both assessments had the highest mean score. Cottage 8 in the January 1980 and Cottage 9 in May 1981 had the lowest mean scores. These cottages are the cottages for girls. There were significant differences between the mean scores at both testing periods. No comparison was made across times by cottage since the cottage structure has changed in some cases from 1980 to 1981.

The comparison of scores on the Nowicki-Strickland Personal Reaction Scale are reported in Table 13 for both January 1980 and May 1981.

TABLE 12
1980-81 COMPARISON OF COTTAGES
ON THE COOPERSMITH SELF ESTEEM INVENTORY

COTTAGE	JANUARY 1980			MAY 1981		
	M	SD	N	M	SD	N
1	15.45	5.06	22	18.04	4.26	24
2	20.17	5.35	24	20.50	4.06	12 (STU)
3	19.03	4.97	30	16.49	4.99	39
4	19.15	5.75	26	18.56	5.39	34
5	17.25	2.22	4 (STU)	18.00	6.51	10 (HAYDEN)
6	17.90	3.33	20	15.36	5.26	25
7	18.16	5.21	19	17.00	5.45	8
8	14.42	5.88	19 (F)	20.13	6.27	24
9	18.44	5.15	10 (H)	13.50	6.65	16 (F)
TOTAL	17.95	6.15	174	17.46	5.40	199
F	2.66 ^{xx}			3.149 ^{xx}		

TABLE 13
LOCUS OF CONTROL BY COTTAGE
JANUARY 1980 AND MAY 1981

COTTAGE	JANUARY 1980			MAY 1981		
	M	SD	N	M	SD	N
1	5.18	3.15	22	5.93	3.56	30
2	6.67	3.18	24	6.17	3.61	12
3	5.70	3.64	30	7.00	3.53	38
4	5.59	3.80	26	5.74	3.87	34
5	3.67	0.58	4	7.50	4.38	10
6	8.80	3.71	20	4.19	2.65	26
7	5.37	4.04	19	5.75	4.53	8
8	8.42	2.93	19	4.80	3.71	25
9	6.10	4.91	10	10.25	2.73	16
TOTAL	6.36	3.75		6.17	3.56	199
F	2.94 ^{**}			4.63 ^{***}		

Cottage six in the May 1981 assessment had the lowest mean score (more internal orientated) while Cottage 9 had the highest mean (more externally orientated). In 1980 Cottage 5 had the lowest mean and Cottage 8 the highest mean. There were significant differences in the locus of control by cottage on both the January 1980 and May 1981 assessments. Again girls tended to be the most external in orientation.

The Jesness Behavior Rating Form was administered on each of the three testing periods. Cottage differences for May 1981 are presented in Table 14A. There were significant differences on six of the scales, Sociability, Independence, Consideration, Friendliness, Unobtrusiveness, and Social Concern. Cottage 4 and 7 tend to have the highest mean scores while Cottages 6, 5, and 9 tend to have lower mean scores. Comparisons for the January 1980 data can be found in Table 14B. The comparison of the May 1980 testing by cottage is presented in Table 14C. There are fewer significant differences among cottages on the May 1981 testing than on either the January 1980 or May 1980 testings.

TABLE 14A
COTTAGE DIFFERENCES ON THE JESNESS MAY 1981

SCALE	1	2	3	4	5	COTTAGE 6	7	8	9	F	
ANGER CONTROL	14.10 3.30	13.67 2.77	13.69 2.74	15.76 3.58	14.50 3.14	13.60 4.27	14.00 3.07	13.88 3.93	13.56 2.85	1.256	NS
INSIGHT	25.07 3.81	25.25 5.41	23.51 4.58	24.21 7.16	24.40 4.99	20.92 7.07	26.88 2.75	24.68 4.50	22.44 3.10	1.853	NS
CALMNESS	20.00 3.58	19.00 4.49	19.08 4.00	20.71 5.26	18.80 1.81	18.44 5.55	20.13 4.52	19.20 5.76	17.88 4.88	0.815	NS
SOCIABILITY	18.80 3.54	17.83 3.88	17.90 2.85	20.44 3.45	18.50 3.31	16.92 5.77	18.88 2.59	17.76 4.17	18.06 3.02	1.992	.05
CONFORMITY	23.67 3.30	22.17 2.17	22.79 3.41	24.03 5.14	24.00 3.02	23.28 5.29	25.63 3.46	23.76 3.99	22.63 3.81	0.793	NS
ENTHUSIASM	16.73 2.88	15.08 3.29	16.28 2.66	17.29 3.29	16.10 3.11	17.04 4.60	17.63 2.62	16.60 2.92	17.81 3.37	1.030	NS
RAPPORT	18.70 3.22	16.75 4.05	17.28 4.04	20.15 3.47	17.00 4.00	17.24 5.16	18.75 4.56	17.56 4.66	17.38 3.93	1.868	NS
COMMUNICATION	18.10 3.30	18.33 4.74	18.33 3.02	19.09 4.41	18.00 4.27	17.64 5.04	19.13 3.23	17.28 4.75	17.38 3.20	0.572	NS
INDEPENDENCE	15.97 2.67	17.08 2.81	16.44 2.41	17.06 3.04	16.70 1.95	15.64 2.53	17.75 2.82	18.44 2.58	15.81 2.64	2.682	.0082
CONSIDERATION	25.53 3.46	24.33 4.19	23.69 4.35	26.62 4.26	22.00 5.31	23.40 7.03	25.88 4.82	23.64 4.79	25.81 3.64	2.034	.0444
RESPONSIBILITY	33.83 4.64	34.75 3.44	34.10 4.18	36.09 5.04	33.00 5.66	32.32 6.18	37.50 4.24	34.32 3.99	35.00 4.13	1.810	NS
FRIENDLINESS	17.30 2.55	13.59 2.47	16.03 2.80	16.26 3.60	15.50 2.68	16.80 3.76	19.13 2.03	16.72 2.79	14.88 3.44	3.140	.001
UNOBTRUSIVE	27.70 4.49	26.00 2.80	27.90 4.01	29.82 4.47	24.30 5.08	26.00 5.14	30.00 5.35	29.28 3.16	26.50 5.22	3.270	.001
SOCIAL CONCERN	14.87 2.52	14.58 2.64	16.38 2.44	16.65 3.69	14.60 3.41	14.08 3.60	17.13 2.36	15.88 2.86	14.25 2.77	2.870	.01

TABLE 14B
COTTAGE DIFFERENCES ON THE JESNESS JANUARY 1980

SCALE		COTTAGE									TOTAL	F
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		
ANGER CONTROL	M	15.18	15.21	13.97	16.19	14.00	11.95	14.58	12.21	14.00	14.27	3.503***
	SD	3.17	3.24	3.71	4.14	2.00	3.03	2.61	3.28	4.16	3.62	
INSIGHT	M	24.32	25.33	26.20	26.23	22.25	20.60	23.32	22.00	23.00	24.16	4.936***
	SD	4.47	3.55	3.24	2.67	2.99	7.10	2.26	4.11	4.19	4.42	
CALMNESS	M	18.45	21.33	19.60	22.00	19.25	19.90	21.53	15.58	20.30	19.89	5.785***
	SD	4.64	3.91	3.30	2.99	2.06	3.68	3.69	3.75	3.40	4.05	
SOCIABILITY	M	19.23	19.25	18.40	20.96	15.25	15.30	18.58	16.84	17.80	18.39	4.251***
	SD	3.95	3.52	3.95	4.23	2.75	3.76	2.82	3.30	4.85	4.05	
CONFORMITY	M	23.18	24.58	22.93	25.54	19.00	21.70	24.26	20.68	23.00	23.25	3.411**
	SD	3.32	5.48	3.59	3.37	3.56	5.47	3.28	3.33	3.74	4.26	
ENTHUSIASM	M	16.68	16.71	17.63	17.81	13.75	15.45	16.74	16.32	15.20	16.69	2.195*
	SD	3.41	3.09	3.65	2.58	2.63	2.70	1.88	2.63	2.09	2.99	
RAPPORT	M	18.96	18.17	18.30	19.58	13.00	15.60	18.79	16.58	15.10	17.80	3.073*
	SD	4.05	4.46	5.05	3.83	6.38	3.93	3.36	3.66	3.76	4.38	
EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATIONS	M	17.41	19.46	20.10	20.58	16.25	16.45	17.68	16.47	18.50	14.48	5.100***
	SD	3.39	3.60	2.84	3.29	1.50	3.46	2.81	3.29	3.84	3.55	
INDEPENDENCE	M	15.41	18.29	17.47	18.35	20.00	18.55	16.89	16.58	18.10	17.51	3,270**
	SD	2.70	3.17	2.39	2.38	2.71	3.47	2.54	2.46	3.60	2.93	
SOCIAL CONTROL	M	15.55	16.04	15.07	16.88	13.75	14.95	16.68	15.53	13.50	15.63	1.936 NS
	SD	2.59	3.76	2.88	2.79	0.50	3.59	3.00	2.70	3.37	3.12	
CONSIDERATENESS	M	27.59	25.13	25.23	26.50	18.00	20.50	24.89	22.05	22.40	24.45	4.880***
	SD	5.12	5.30	4.49	5.51	3.83	6.12	3.26	4.31	6.31	5.46	
RESPONSIBILITY	M	33.32	37.08	33.63	37.77	34.00	32.60	34.21	32.37	33.90	34.52	4.584***
	SD	4.91	3.01	4.77	2.32	3.16	5.63	4.25	3.88	4.89	4.57	
FRIENDLINESS	M	17.18	15.38	16.40	16.23	14.75	15.55	17.37	15.74	14.80	16.17	1.089 NS
	SD	3.08	4.04	3.17	3.50	3.30	3.57	3.15	2.83	3.46	3.38	
UNOBTRUSIVENESS	M	29.05	28.50	26.77	29.88	28.25	26.05	29.10	27.53	24.80	27.94	2.725**
	SD	3.75	4.06	4.36	3.86	3.50	4.57	4.74	2.72	5.35	4.30	

TABLE 14C

COMPARISON OF JESNESS BEHAVIOR RATING SCALE
BY COTTAGE MAY 1980 TESTING

SCALE	1		2		3		4		6		7		8		9		F
	M	S.D.	M	S.D.	M	S.D.	M	S.D.	M	S.D.	M	S.D.	M	S.D.	M	S.D.	
UNOBTUSIVE	30.69	6.14	32.74	5.10	32.67	4.98	34.34	3.27	26.36	5.50	29.20	7.02	29.74	6.63	30.64	4.54	4.36***
FRIENDLINESS	16.69	4.20	18.70	4.71	17.61	4.79	20.31	3.97	15.27	3.41	18.00	4.60	17.35	5.47	16.45	3.14	2.39*
RESPONSIBILITY	32.24	7.54	38.56	4.78	33.36	8.61	37.79	6.60	30.27	6.47	34.73	6.63	31.61	6.02	30.09	8.19	4.47***
CONSIDERATENESS	25.93	5.04	28.67	4.35	23.22	5.70	29.24	4.88	22.27	3.85	25.00	5.00	24.74	4.38	24.00	4.34	6.08***
INDEPENDENCE	16.00	2.74	16.81	2.94	16.64	3.44	17.34	3.66	15.82	2.52	15.67	3.94	15.70	2.58	17.27	3.55	0.978
RAPPORT	17.62	3.55	19.52	3.71	17.06	3.76	20.38	3.93	15.73	3.32	19.73	3.08	16.27	4.26	16.55	4.20	4.56***
ENTHUSIASM	16.72	3.27	19.22	3.51	17.33	3.11	20.10	4.19	15.82	1.94	19.27	3.47	16.45	2.82	16.36	3.75	4.84***
SOCIABILITY	14.72	3.02	15.70	2.83	15.00	3.23	16.93	2.71	13.55	3.24	14.90	3.28	15.23	3.34	13.64	3.44	2.41*
CONFORMITY	23.31	5.29	28.07	4.40	25.03	5.00	27.69	4.93	19.36	4.95	26.33	2.72	23.77	5.00	24.64	6.22	5.69***
CALMNESS	19.72	3.65	23.00	4.31	20.75	3.90	23.69	4.85	19.00	3.32	20.13	4.17	19.59	3.78	19.45	3.80	4.37***
COMMUNICATION	18.17	4.14	19.48	3.82	18.89	3.85	20.69	2.47	17.18	4.31	19.67	3.89	17.73	3.15	18.45	5.30	1.93
INSIGHT	21.41	4.30	25.81	3.34	22.11	5.69	26.24	4.26	21.00	4.15	22.67	4.39	20.91	4.25	21.64	4.38	5.55***
SOCIAL CONTROL	14.52	2.73	16.15	2.70	15.86	2.40	16.90	2.13	12.27	3.59	15.53	2.70	13.68	3.40	14.55	3.36	5.38***
ANGER CONTROL	13.97	2.54	15.59	2.94	14.03	2.86	16.14	3.30	10.36	2.41	14.47	3.18	12.73	3.25	14.73	2.33	6.27***

The youth completed the FIRO B both in January of 1980 and May of 1981. The cottage comparisons are presented in Table 15. There were three significant F values across the cottages on the January 1980 testing. These were on the Expressed Inclusion, Wanted Inclusion, and Inclusion Scales. On the May 1981 testings, there were significant differences again on the Expressed Inclusion Scales, but not on the Wanted Inclusion and Inclusion Scales. There were differences on four other scales, Wanted Control, Wanted Behavior, Control, and Total Scales.

On the 1981 assessment on the Expressed Inclusion Scale, Cottage 9 (the girls) has the highest mean score and Cottages 3 and 5 have the lowest mean scores. On the Wanted Control Scale in 1981, Cottage 5 and Cottage 9 have the highest mean scores. Cottage 7 and Cottage 4 have the lowest mean scores. On the Wanted Behavior Scale, Cottage 9 and Cottage 5 have the highest mean scores while Cottage 7 has the lowest mean score. On the Control Scale, Cottage 5 has the highest mean score and Cottage 7 the lowest. On the total FIRO score, Cottages 9 and 5 have the highest mean scores and Cottage 7 the lowest score. Cottage 9 is the girls' unit while in the numbering this time, 5 is the Hayden Unit.

Cottage differences were also found on the Reality Therapy Activities Index. There were differences on three of the items, Accept Responsibility for Behavior (see Table 15A) and Evaluate My Behavior (see Table 15B). Not all cottages completed the same form. Two items relating to values were not included on the older forms given Cottages 1, 2 and 8. There were significant differences between cottages on the item relating to recognizing and relating

TABLE 15
COTTAGE COMPARISONS ON THE FIRO B

SCALE		1	2	3	4	COTTAGE		7	8	9	TOTAL	F
						5	6					
EXPRESSED INCLUSION	J80 M	4.64	5.08	4.47	5.35	1.75	3.65	3.79	4.32	3.50	4.40	2.341*
	SD	2.01	2.22	2.42	2.02	2.06	1.73	1.99	2.52	2.84	2.27	
	M81 M	3.97	4.25	3.79	4.91	3.78	5.28	4.75	4.33	5.69	4.49	2.315*
	SD	1.97	1.76	2.12	1.63	1.99	2.34	2.66	2.30	1.78	2.05	
EXPRESSED AFFECTION	J80 M	4.36	4.17	3.30	3.31	2.75	3.10	3.68	3.32	2.50	3.52	1.077 NS
	SD	2.80	2.32	2.42	2.42	2.24	1.71	1.89	2.24	2.38	1.72	
	M81 M	4.13	2.92	2.79	3.70	3.78	3.68	3.50	3.83	4.25	3.53	1.346 NS
	SD	2.01	2.07	1.66	2.07	2.99	1.93	2.20	2.58	2.14	2.10	
EXPRESSED CONTROL	J80 M	2.27	2.75	2.80	1.96	1.00	2.40	1.84	2.26	3.20	2.37	0.0907NS
	SD	2.68	1.96	2.31	1.61	2.00	2.06	1.57	2.56	2.30	2.14	
	M81 M	3.03	2.58	2.34	2.12	4.11	3.36	1.50	2.62	2.38	2.64	1.563 NS
	SD	2.81	1.88	1.83	1.95	3.44	1.99	1.41	2.32	2.06	2.21	
WANTED INCLUSION	J80 M	4.64	5.67	4.40	5.23	0.75	3.40	5.16	2.58	3.30	4.35	2.660**
	SD	3.57	3.56	3.33	2.96	1.50	2.96	2.71	2.91	4.14	3.31	
	M81 M	4.90	3.08	3.39	4.33	4.33	4.60	2.88	4.08	5.50	4.20	1.177 NS
	SD	3.16	3.03	3.36	3.58	3.12	2.96	3.36	3.32	3.14	3.27	
WANTED AFFECTION	J80 M	7.95	8.63	8.83	8.23	7.00	7.60	8.95	7.95	8.00	8.29	1.191 NS
	SD	2.24	2.60	1.90	2.32	2.16	1.64	1.43	2.04	2.49	2.10	
	M81 M	8.10	8.67	8.08	8.12	8.67	7.92	7.00	7.75	8.19	8.06	0.612 NS
	SD	2.50	1.83	1.65	2.23	2.50	1.93	1.85	1.59	1.97	2.02	
WANTED CONTROL	J80 M	4.64	3.71	4.47	3.88	3.75	4.35	3.53	5.89	3.50	4.26	1.294 NS
	SD	2.15	2.96	2.85	2.80	1.50	2.96	2.82	3.16	3.37	2.86	
	M81 M	5.10	4.12	4.34	3.24	6.33	5.64	3.00	4.50	6.25	4.66	2.379*
	SD	3.55	2.36	3.20	2.12	4.21	3.33	2.14	3.24	3.80	3.15	
INCLUSION	J80 M	9.27	10.75	8.87	10.58	2.50	7.05	8.95	6.89	6.80	8.75	2.946**
	SD	4.99	4.83	4.87	4.39	3.00	3.95	3.50	4.59	6.65	4.84	
	M81 M	8.87	7.33	7.18	9.24	8.11	9.88	7.63	8.42	11.18	8.69	1.602 NS
	SD	3.98	4.31	4.65	4.64	4.68	4.85	5.58	4.66	4.33	4.58	

TABLE 15
(continued)

SCALE		COTTAGE									TOTAL	F
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		
WANTED BEHAVIOR	J80 M	17.23	18.00	17.70	17.35	11.50	15.35	17.63	16.42	14.80	16.90	1.288 NS
	SD	4.18	5.63	5.16	2.65	5.78	3.06	4.98	6.56	5.24		
	M81 M	18.10	16.17	15.82	15.70	19.33	18.16	12.88	16.33	19.94	16.91	2.072*
	SD	7.17	4.06	5.44	6.03	7.05	3.75	3.72	5.13	5.56	5.72	
EXPRESSED BEHAVIOR	J80 M	11.27	12.00	10.57	10.62	5.50	9.15	9.32	9.89	9.20	10.29	1.335 NS
	SD	5.99	4.86	4.97	4.00	5.07	3.87	4.61	4.81	5.25	4.85	
	M81 M	11.13	9.75	8.92	10.73	11.67	12.32	9.75	10.29	12.31	10.66	1.836 NS
	SD	3.95	3.33	3.84	3.79	5.39	3.98	4.59	5.62	4.22	4.31	
AFFECTION	J80 M	12.32	12.79	12.13	11.54	9.75	10.70	12.63	11.26	10.50	11.80	1.076 NS
	SD	4.13	3.82	3.66	3.57	2.87	2.89	2.87	3.87	3.78	3.59	
	M81 M	12.23	11.58	10.87	11.82	12.44	11.60	10.50	11.08	12.44	11.59	0.757 NS
	SD	3.37	3.32	2.74	3.70	4.93	3.21	2.88	3.35	3.18	3.34	
CONTROL	J80 M	6.91	6.46	7.27	5.85	4.75	6.75	5.37	8.16	6.70	6.64	1.023 NS
	SD	3.38	3.35	4.14	3.62	3.10	4.27	3.83	3.66	4.81	3.82	
	M81 M	8.13	7.00	6.68	5.36	10.44	9.00	4.50	7.13	8.63	7.29	3.028*
	SD	5.01	3.86	3.91	3.22	4.42	4.74	2.00	4.20	4.10	4.13	
TOTAL FIRO	J80 M	28.50	30.00	28.27	27.96	17.00	24.50	26.95	26.32	24.00	27.19	1.558 NS
	SD	9.97	8.64	9.24	7.72	7.66	9.03	6.15	8.54	11.31	8.86	
	M81 M	29.23	25.92	24.74	26.42	31.00	30.48	22.63	26.63	32.25	27.57	2.368**
	SD	9.66	6.78	8.09	9.04	8.82	6.79	8.07	8.51	8.66	8.67	

TABLE 15A

COTTAGE COMPARISON OF HOW YOUTH ACCEPTED RESPONSIBILITY FOR THEIR DECISIONS MAY 1981

CATEGORY	COTTAGE								
	1 (30)	2 (12)	3 (38)	4 (32)	5 (10)	6 (24)	7 (8)	8 (27)	9 (14)
NEVER	0.0	8.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
SELDOM	0.0	0.0	5.1	3.1	0.0	12.5	0.0	11.1	0.0
SOME OF THE TIME	20.0	25.0	20.5	15.6	20.0	33.3	14.3	14.8	46.7
MOST OF THE TIME	46.7	16.7	46.2	15.6	40.0	29.2	42.9	55.6	40.0
ALL OF THE TIME	33.3	50.0	28.2	65.6	40.0	25.0	42.9	18.5	13.3

 $\chi^2 = 58.23$ p.01

TABLE 15B

COTTAGE COMPARISON OF HOW YOUTH EVALUATED THEIR BEHAVIOR MAY 1981

CATEGORY	COTTAGE								
	1 (30)	2 (12)	3 (38)	4 (32)	5 (10)	6 (24)	7 (8)	8 (27)	9 (14)
NEVER	0.0	8.3	5.3	0.0	10.0	0.0	25.0	29.6	14.3
SELDOM	10.0	25.0	28.4	6.3	0.0	16.7	0.0	18.5	35.7
SOME OF THE TIME	46.7	33.3	29.5	28.1	20.0	37.5	25.0	22.2	35.7
MOST OF THE TIME	40.0	16.7	28.9	31.3	40.0	25.0	37.5	22.2	7.1
ALL OF THE TIME	3.3	16.7	7.9	34.4	30.0	20.8	12.5	7.4	7.1

 $\chi^2 = 64.79$ $p.002$

my values. The differences can be seen by the different proportions of individuals in the separate cottages checking a given option. For example, 65.6 percent of Cottage 4 youth claim they accept responsibility for their decisions while only 13.3 percent of Cottage 9 and 18.5 percent of Cottage 8 do.

There have been four assessments by the youth of the environment using the Correctional Institution Environment Scale. A comparison across the different testings is given in Table 16.

In comparing the March 1980 to May 1981 assessments of youth, there is a greater than 10 percent increase of individuals in May 1981 checking true in a category than in March 1980 on the following items:

- Residents are proud of the youth center (62.4 to 47.9)
- Staff sometimes argue with each other (56.1 to 43.2)
- Residents are encouraged to take leadership (93.1 to 76.5)
- Residents are encouraged to learn new ways of doing things (93.6 to 82.6)
- Staff are always changing their minds (65.9 to 42.1)
- Decisions about center made by staff (68.8 to 56.4)
- Things disorganized around here (75.1 to 63.5)

There was a 10 percent or more decrease from 1981 to 1980 of individuals checking true on the following items:

- Staff act on residents' suggestions (50.3 to 31.1)
- If program changed, youth told why (72.7 to 62.4)
- Youth may criticize staff member to face (44.0 to 31.8)
- Staff gives youth little responsibility (33.3 to 17.9)

TABLE 16
CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION ENVIRONMENT
SCALE COMPARISONS 1980 to 1981
YOUTH

		Mar 1980 (150)	May 1980 (180)	Nov 1980 (53)	May 1981 (173)
1.	Residents proud of youth center	T 47.9 F 52.1	63.1 36.3	64.2 35.8	62.4 37.6
2.	Little time to encourage residents	T 32.2 F 67.8	27.0 73.0	30.2 69.8	31.8 68.2
3.	Youth encouraged to show their feelings	T 69.1 F 30.9	77.1 22.8	62.3 37.7	68.2 31.2
4.	Staff act on resident's suggestions	T 50.3 F 49.7	59.2 40.8	50.9 49.1	31.1 65.3
5.	Little emphasis on youth making plans for getting out	T 32.9 F 67.1	23.5 76.1	17.0 83.0	23.1 76.3
6.	Youth share personal problems with each other	T 61.9 F 38.1	70.6 18.9	66.0 34.0	60.7 39.3
7.	Facilities are always neat	T 86.0 F 14.0	89.4 10.6	90.6 9.4	91.3 8.7
8.	Staff sometimes argue with each other	T 43.2 F 56.8	30.7 69.3	60.4 39.6	56.1 43.9
9.	Residents must follow schedule	T 91.8 F 8.2	84.8 15.2	90.6 9.4	85.0 15.0
10.	Residents really try to improve	T 72.7 F 27.3	74.7 25.3	56.6 43.4	65.3 34.1
11.	Staff interested in follow-up of youth	T 45.8 F 54.2	60.0 40.0	50.9 49.1	54.9 44.5
12.	Youth hide feelings from the staff	T 79.7 F 20.3	63.7 36.3	83.0 17.0	77.5 22.5
13.	Residents are encour- aged to take leader- ship	T 76.5 F 23.5	91.5 8.5	90.6 9.4	93.1 6.9
14.	Youth rarely talk about their personal problems	T 52.7 F 47.3	35.0 65.0	54.7 45.3	43.4 56.6

15.	Day Room is often messy	T	33.6	19.8	30.2	35.3
		F	66.4	80.2	69.8	64.7
16.	If program changed, youth told why	T	72.7	76.8	67.9	62.4
		F	27.3	23.2	32.1	37.6
17.	Youth may criticize staff member to face	T	44.0	40.1	45.3	31.8
		F	56.0	59.9	54.7	68.2
18.	Youth care about each other	T	59.7	68.4	62.3	43.4
		F	40.3	31.6	37.7	55.5
19.	Staff help youth get acquainted	T	78.7	80.1	64.2	74.0
		F	21.3	19.9	35.8	25.4
20.	Staff and youth tell how they feel about each other	T	50.3	60.7	50.9	45.7
		F	49.7	39.3	49.1	53.2
21.	Staff gives youth little responsibility	T	33.3	23.0	30.2	17.9
		F	66.7	77.0	69.8	81.5
22.	Encouraged to learn new ways of doing	T	82.6	87.6	86.8	93.6
		F	17.4	12.4	13.2	6.4
23.	Personal problems openly talked about	T	48.6	53.4	49.1	41.0
		F	51.4	46.6	50.9	59.0
24.	Center usually looks messy	T	47.7	37.3	54.7	55.5
		F	52.3	62.7	45.3	44.5
25.	Youth explained how Center works	T	90.0	89.9	98.1	95.4
		F	10.0	10.2	1.9	4.6
26.	Youth will be trans- ferred if disobedient	T	69.8	59.3	47.2	53.2
		F	30.2	40.7	52.8	46.8
27.	Little group spirit at MYC	T	45.5	36.2	39.6	37.0
		F	54.1	63.8	60.4	62.4
28.	More mature youth take care of less	T	71.8	74.6	66.0	67.6
		F	28.2	25.4	34.0	32.4
29.	People say what they really think	T	62.6	61.6	58.5	39.3
		F	37.4	38.4	41.5	60.7
30.	Youth have a say about what goes on	T	51.7	43.8	28.3	20.8
		F	48.3	56.]	71.7	78.6
31.	Little emphasis on what youth do after	T	48.6	38.2	35.8	35.3
		F	51.4	61.8	64.2	64.7

32.	Discussions emphasize understanding persons	T	61.6	59.6	58.5	66.5
		F	38.4	40.4	41.5	33.5
33.	MYC well-organized unit	T	66.0	68.5	55.7	67.6
		F	34.0	31.5	45.3	31.2
34.	Staff are always changing minds	T	42.1	52.8	28.3	65.9
		F	57.9	47.2	71.7	34.1
35.	Decisions about Center made by staff	T	56.4	55.1	60.4	68.8
		F	43.6	44.9	39.6	31.2
36.	Youth put a lot of energy in what they do	T	65.8		54.7	60.1
		F	34.2		45.3	39.9
37.	Youth rarely help each other	T	36.7		52.8	30.6
		F	63.3		47.2	69.4
38.	Youth say anything to counselors	T	25.0		18.9	10.4
		F	75.0		81.8	89.6
39.	Staff discourages criticism	T	59.2		64.2	50.9
		F	40.8		35.8	48.6
40.	Care more about feelings than personal	T	46.6		47.2	40.5
		F	53.4		52.8	59.0
41.	Staff interested in learning about feelings	T	55.8		52.8	43.9
		F	44.2		47.2	55.5
42.	Things disorganized around here	T	63.5		77.4	75.1
		F	36.5		22.6	24.9
43.	Staff tell youth when they are doing well	T	79.7		75.5	84.4
		F	20.3		24.5	15.6
44.	Youth rarely punished	T	26.8		17.0	22.0
		F	73.2		83.0	78.0
45.	MYC has very little social activities	T	64.2		28.3	34.1
		F	35.8		71.7	65.9
46.	Staff go out of way to help youth	T	57.3		50.9	59.0
		F	42.7		49.1	41.0
47.	Youth careful what they say	T	88.7		84.9	93.1
		F	11.3		15.1	6.9
48.	Youth encouraged to start their own activities	T	60.1		60.4	68.8
		F	39.9		39.6	31.2
49.	MYC emphasizes job training	T	45.0		39.6	50.9
		F	55.0		60.4	49.1

Youth will be transferred if disobedient (69.8 to 53.2)

People say what they really think (62.6 to 39.3)

Youth have a say about what goes on here (61.7 to 20.8)

Little emphasis on what youth do after getting out of MYC
(48.6 to 35.3).

Youth say anything to counselors (25.0 to 10.4)

Staff interested in learning about feelings (55.8 to 43.9)

MYC has very little social activities (64.2 to 34.1)

On the May 1981 assessment, it should be noted that over 90 percent of the youth agreed that:

Facilities are always neat (91.3)

Residents are encouraged to take leadership (93.1)

Residents are encouraged to learn new ways of doing things (93.6)

Youth explained how center works (95.4)

Youth careful about what they say (93.1)

Cottage differences were compared on the May 1981 assessment and are presented in Table 17. The first 43 items are presented with the percent of youth at each cottage checking true and checking false. It should be noted that only one person from Cottage 6 completed the scale so the results cannot be generalized for that cottage. There are significant differences in the proportions of youth checking the response options on 38 of the 43 items by cottage. There are marked differences in the perceptions of the youth of the environment by cottage.

There were five items that did not have significant differences. Two were from the Practical Orientation Scale, two from Staff Control,

TABLE 17
COTTAGE DIFFERENCES ON THE CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION ENVIRONMENT SCALE
MAY 1981

		(30) 1	(12) 2	(39) 3	(34) 4	(10) 5	(1) 6	(6) 7	(25) 8	(16) 9	Chi Square
1. Residents are proud of their units	T	90.0	41.7	51.3	79.4	100.0	0.0	66.7	32.0	43.8	38.15***
	F	10.0	58.3	48.7	20.6	0.0	100.0	33.3	68.0	56.3	
2. Staff have little time to encourage residents	T	10.0	8.3	43.6	26.5	26.0	100.0	16.7	64.0	31.3	27.94***
	F	90.0	91.7	56.4	73.5	80.0	0.0	83.3	36.0	68.8	
3. Residents encouraged to show feelings	T	80.0	91.7	46.2	73.5	100.0	100.0	83.3	64.0	50.0	52.17***
	F	20.0	8.3	53.8	26.5	0.0	0.0	16.7	36.0	50.0	
4. Staff acts on resident's suggestions	T	50.0	25.0	23.1	35.3	30.0	100.0	50.0	28.0	37.5	37.72**
	F	50.0	75.0	76.9	64.7	70.0	0.0	50.0	72.0	62.5	
5. Little emphasis is on plans for getting out	T	6.7	0.0	41.0	11.8	30.0	0.0	33.3	32.0	37.5	49.27***
	F	93.3	100.0	59.0	88.2	70.0	100.0	66.7	68.0	62.5	
6. Residents expected to share personal problems	T	56.7	83.3	46.2	82.4	70.0	0.0	66.7	48.0	56.3	16.74*
	F	43.3	16.7	53.8	17.6	30.0	100.0	33.3	52.0	43.8	
7. Staff makes sure the unit is always neat	T	100.0	83.3	82.1	94.1	100.0	100.0	100.0	84.0	100.0	13.22 NS
	F	0.0	16.7	17.9	5.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.0	0.0	
8. Staff sometimes argue with each other	T	3.3	41.7	84.6	97.1	40.0	0.0	50.0	24.0	75.0	86.16***
	F	96.7	58.3	15.4	2.9	60.0	100.0	50.0	76.0	25.0	
9. Residents must follow schedule	T	93.3	91.7	76.9	85.3	80.0	100.0	66.7	100.0	68.8	13.71 NS
	F	6.7	8.3	23.1	14.7	20.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	31.3	
10. Residents try to im- prove themselves	T	30.0	75.0	48.8	85.3	90.0	0.0	66.7	84.0	87.5	44.06***
	F	70.0	25.0	51.2	14.7	10.0	100.0	33.3	16.0	12.5	

			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
11.	Staff interested in following up residents	T	63.3	83.3	41.3	23.5	70.0	0.0	50.0	64.0	75.0	52.29***
		F	36.7	16.7	48.7	76.5	30.0	100.0	50.0	36.0	25.0	
12.	Residents hide feelings from staff	T	66.7	75.0	87.2	70.6	100.0	0.0	100.0	80.0	68.8	13.95 NS
		F	33.3	25.0	12.8	29.4	0.0	100.0	0.0	20.0	81.3	
13.	Residents expected to take leadership	T	90.0	91.7	64.1	100.0	66.0	100.0	33.3	92.0	56.3	36.05***
		F	10.0	8.3	35.9	0.0	40.0	0.0	66.7	8.0	43.8	
14.	Residents encouraged to plan for future	T	96.7	100.0	89.7	100.0	100.0	100.0	66.7	84.0	93.8	15.19 NS
		F	3.3	0.0	10.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	16.0	6.3	
15.	Residents rarely share personal problems	T	43.3	41.7	48.7	26.5	70.0	100.0	83.3	24.0	62.5	18.72*
		F	56.7	58.3	51.3	73.5	30.0	0.0	16.7	76.0	37.5	
16.	Day room often messy	T	20.0	16.7	48.7	67.6	20.0	0.0	16.7	4.0	43.8	37.28***
		F	80.0	83.3	51.3	32.4	80.0	100.0	83.3	96.0	56.3	
17.	Resident told why his schedule is changed	T	83.3	83.3	46.2	61.8	90.0	0.0	66.7	52.0	50.0	19.40*
		F	16.7	16.7	53.8	38.2	10.0	100.0	33.3	48.0	50.0	
18.	Residents may criticize staff members	T	40.0	16.7	35.9	26.5	40.0	0.0	33.3	28.0	31.3	3.90 NS
		F	60.0	83.3	64.1	73.5	60.0	100.0	66.7	72.0	68.8	
19.	Residents in unit care about each other	T	36.7	8.3	15.4	70.6	70.0	0.0	66.7	36.0	81.3	59.29***
		F	63.3	91.7	84.6	29.4	30.0	100.0	33.3	64.0	18.8	
20.	Staff help residents get acquainted	T	73.3	75.0	71.8	55.9	90.0	0.0	83.3	96.0	75.0	46.13***
		F	26.7	25.0	28.2	44.1	10.0	100.0	16.7	4.0	25.0	
21.	Staff and residents say how they feel	T	30.0	66.7	33.3	38.2	80.0	0.0	50.0	68.0	50.0	76.42***
		F	70.0	33.3	66.7	61.8	20.0	100.0	50.0	32.0	50.0	
22.	Staff give residents little responsibility	T	3.3	16.7	25.6	11.8	20.0	0.0	16.7	44.0	6.3	49.03***
		F	96.7	83.3	74.4	88.2	80.0	100.0	83.3	56.0	93.8	
23.	Residents encouraged to learn new things	T	100.0	91.7	92.3	94.1	90.0	0.0	83.3	92.0	100.0	19.47*
		F	0.0	8.3	7.7	5.9	10.0	100.0	16.7	8.0	0.0	

			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
24.	Personal problems openly talked about	T	30.0	50.0	38.5	58.8	80.0	100.0	50.0	12.0	37.5	23.16**
		F	70.0	50.0	61.5	41.1	20.0	0.0	50.0	88.0	62.5	
25.	Unit looks a little messy	T	30.0	33.3	79.5	70.6	100.0	100.0	0.0	32.0	56.3	44.40***
		F	70.0	66.7	20.5	29.4	0.0	0.0	100.0	68.2	43.8	
26.	Someone shows nrw resident around	T	100.0	100.0	89.7	97.1	100.0	0.0	100.0	96.0	93.8	26.59***
		F	0.0	0.0	16.3	2.9	0.0	100.0	0.0	4.0	8.7	
27.	Residents transferred for disobedience	T	16.7	41.7	84.6	26.5	90.0	100.0	83.3	92.0	12.5	76.20***
		F	83.3	58.3	14.5	73.5	10.0	0.0	16.7	8.0	87.5	
28.	Very little group spirit in unit	T	20.0	33.3	61.5	17.6	60.0	0.0	50.0	36.0	43.8	28.79*
		F	80.0	66.7	38.5	82.4	40.0	100.0	50.0	64.0	56.3	
29.	More mature ones take care of less mature	T	73.3	58.3	61.5	88.2	80.0	0.0	66.7	64.0	37.5	17.75*
		F	26.7	41.7	38.5	11.8	20.0	100.0	33.3	36.0	62.5	
30.	People say what they really think	T	23.3	41.7	38.5	23.5	60.0	0.0	83.3	64.0	37.5	20.53*
		F	76.7	58.3	61.5	76.5	40.0	100.0	16.7	36.0	62.5	
31.	Residents have a say about what goes on here	T	33.3	8.3	15.4	8.8	60.0	100.0	33.3	16.0	18.8	39.19***
		F	66.7	91.7	84.6	91.2	40.00	0.0	66.7	84.0	81.3	
32.	Little emphasis on residents after leaving	T	40.0	16.7	38.5	32.4	40.0	0	33.3	24.0	56.3	7.54 NS
		F	60.0	83.3	61.5	67.6	60.0	100.0	66.7	76.0	43.8	
33.	Discussions emphasize understanding person	T	70.0	58.3	38.5	85.3	80.0	100.0	66.7	72.0	75.0	21.85**
		F	30.0	41.7	61.5	14.7	20.0	0.0	33.3	28.0	25.0	
34.	Unit is very well organized	T	73.3	83.3	43.6	88.2	80.0	0.0	50.0	64.0	68.8	44.56***
		F	26.7	16.7	56.4	11.8	20.0	100.0	50.0	36.0	31.3	

			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
35.	Staff are always changing their minds	T	46.7	41.7	79.5	79.4	20.0	100.0	33.3	88.0	62.5	32.28***
		F	53.3	58.3	20.5	20.6	80.0	0.0	66.7	12.0	32.5	
36.	Decisions made by staff, not residents	T	30.0	50.0	92.3	70.6	20.0	0.0	83.3	96.0	81.3	56.75**
		F	70.0	50.0	7.7	29.4	80.0	100.0	16.7	4.00	18.8	
37.	Residents put a lot of energy into what they do	T	53.3	66.7	46.2	82.4	80.0	0.0	66.7	52.0	56.3	15.02 NS
		F	46.7	33.3	53.8	17.6	20.0	100.0	33.3	48.0	43.8	
38.	Residents rarely help each other	T	3.3	33.3	43.6	11.8	60.0	100.0	50.0	32.0	56.3	31.68***
		F	96.7	66.7	56.4	88.2	40.0	0.0	50.0	68.0	43.8	
39.	Residents say what they want to the counselor	T	6.7	25.0	15.4	0.0	30.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	18.8	25.70***
		F	93.3	75.0	84.6	100.0	70.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	81.3	
40.	Staff discourages criticism	T	56.7	41.7	38.5	38.2	80.0	0.0	33.3	56.0	93.8	51.56***
		F	43.3	58.3	61.5	61.8	20.0	100.0	66.7	44.0	6.3	
41.	Staff care more about resident's feelings	T	40.0	25.0	46.2	41.2	40.0	0.0	33.3	40.0	50.0	31.74**
		F	60.0	75.0	53.8	58.8	60.0	100.0	66.7	60.0	50.0	
42.	Staff interested in how residents feel	T	36.7	66.7	33.3	41.2	90.0	0.0	50.0	32.0	62.5	46.64***
		F	63.3	33.3	66.7	58.2	10.0	100.0	50.0	68.0	37.5	
43.	Things sometimes dis-organized	T	83.3	33.3	84.6	82.4	80.0	0.0	100.0	48.0	87.5	31.43***
		F	16.7	66.7	15.4	17.6	20.0	100.0	0.0	52.0	12.5	

and one from the Order and Organizational Scale. All the items on the Involvement, Support, Expressiveness, Autonomy, Personal Problem Orientation, and Clarity Scales had significant differences across cottages.

STAFF RATINGS COMPARED WITH YOUTH RATINGS

Comparison of student ratings and staff ratings is possible on two of the instruments utilized, the Correctional Institution Environment Scale and the Jesness Behavior Checklist. The staff and youth perceptions of the correctional environment is presented in Table 19. There are marked differences in the perceptions of the environment by the youth and staff. It should be noted that from 10 to 15 percent of the staff felt that they did not have enough basis of information to make a judgment about the youth and the environment. Both youth and staff tend to agree about the practical orientation of the program. Youth tend to see themselves more involved in the aspects of the program than the staff. Staff and youth tend to feel that the staff is supportive. Youth perceive themselves as less expressive than the staff does. The youth perceive themselves as less autonomous than the staff does. The staff considers themselves more personal-problem oriented than do the youth. The staff and youth have mixed views also concerning the order and organization of the center. The staff perceives more order in the environment than the youth. The staff feel that there is greater clarity of rules and procedures than the youth. Youth perceive the staff as being more authoritarian than democratic in working with them.

The youth rated their behavior on the Jesness Behavior Checklist. Trackers also rated the youth. A comparison of the means for each scale by group is presented in Table 18.

TABLE 18
COMPARISON OF YOUTH AND TRACKERS' RATINGS
ON THE JESNESS BEHAVIOR CHECKLIST

SCALE	MEANS			
		TRACKERS' RATINGS		YOUTH
UNOBTRUSIVE	25.22	6.13	27.81	4.58
FRIENDLINESS	17.26	4.65	16.30	3.19
RESPONSIBILITY	29.17	6.84	34.40	4.79
CONSIDERATENESS	21.74	5.43	24.64	4.80
INDEPENDENCE	16.18	2.88	16.68	2.73
RAPPORT	17.21	4.31	18.04	4.16
ENTHUSIASM	16.82	2.85	16.75	3.18
SOCIABILITY	18.32	3.68	18.41	3.87
CONFORMITY	22.20	4.27	23.44	4.04
COMMUNICATION	18.20	3.47	18.15	4.00
INSIGHT	18.24	5.27	23.88	5.39
SOCIAL CONTROL	15.02	3.22	15.51	2.99
ANGER CONTROL	14.35	3.25	14.16	3.41
CALMNESS	19.89	4.15	19.36	4.67

TABLE 19
COMPARISON OF STAFF AND YOUTH PERCEPTIONS
OF THE CORRECTIONAL ENVIRONMENT SPRING 1981

		Group		
		Staff	Youth	
1. Residents are proud of MYC	T	31.4	62.4	y+
	F	58.6	35.8	
	M	10.0		
2. Little time to encourage residents	T	21.4	31.8	
	F	71.4	68.2	
	M	7.1		
3. Youth encouraged to show their feelings	T	74.3	68.2	
	F	18.6	31.2	
	M	7.1		
4. Staff act on resident's suggestions	T	44.3	34.1	s+
	F	41.4	68.2	
	M	14.3		
5. Little emphasis on youth making plans for getting out	T	12.9	23.1	
	F	80.0	76.3	
	M	7.1		
6. Youth share personal problems with each other	T	62.9	60.7	
	F	27.1	39.3	
	M	10.0		
7. Facilities are always neat	T	75.7	91.3	y+
	F	14.3	8.7	
	M	10.0		
8. Staff sometimes argue with each other	T	81.4	56.1	s+
	F	11.4	43.9	
	M	7.1		
9. Residents must follow schedule	T	70.0	85.0	y+
	F	22.9	15.0	
	M	7.1		
10. Residents really try to improve	T	61.4	65.3	
	F	22.9	34.1	
	M	15.7		
11. Staff interested in follow-up of youth	T	58.6	54.9	
	F	30.0	44.5	
	M	11.4		
12. Youth hide feelings from the staff	T	68.6	77.5	y+
	F	20.0	22.5	
	M	11.4		

13. Residents are encouraged to take leadership	T	Staff	Youth	s+
	F	85.7	79.8	
	M	5.7	20.2	
14. Youth encouraged to plan future	T	8.6		y+
	F	70.0	93.1	
	M	21.4	6.9	
15. Youth rarely talk about their personal problems	T	8.6		y+
	F	22.9	43.4	
	M	68.6	56.6	
16. Day room is often messy	T	8.6		
	F	14.3	35.3	
	M	72.9	64.7	
17. If program changed, youth told why	T	12.9		s+
	F	85.7	62.4	
	M	7.1	37.6	
18. Youth may criticize staff members to face	T	7.1		
	F	37.1	31.8	
	M	52.9	68.2	
19. Youth care about each other	T	10.0		
	F	45.7	43.4	
	M	38.6	55.5	
20. Staff help youth get acquainted	T	15.7		s+
	F	84.3	74.0	
	M	5.7	25.4	
21. Staff and youth tell how they feel about each other	T	10.0		s+
	F	55.7	45.7	
	M	31.4	53.2	
22. Staff gives youth little responsibility	T	12.9		
	F	12.9	17.9	
	M	77.1	81.5	
23. Youth encouraged to learn new ways of doing	T	10.0		y+
	F	82.9	93.6	
	M	8.6	6.4	
24. Personal problems openly talked about	T	8.6		s+
	F	62.9	41.0	
	M	24.3	59.0	
25. Center usually looks messy	T	12.9		y+
	F	17.1	55.5	
	M	71.4	44.5	

		<u>Staff</u>	<u>Youth</u>	
26. Youth explained how Center works	T	78.6	95.4	y+
	F	10.0	4.6	
	M	11.4		
27. Youth will be transferred if disobedient	T	57.1	53.2	
	F	32.9	46.8	
	M	10.0		
28. Little group spirit at MYC	T	35.7	37.0	y+
	F	51.4	62.4	
	M	12.9		
29. More mature youth take care of less	T	51.4	67.6	y+
	F	35.7	32.4	
	M	12.9		
30. People say what they really think	T	41.4	39.3	y+
	F	47.1	60.7	
	M	11.4		
31. Youth have a say about what goes on	T	58.6	20.8	s+
	F	30.0	78.6	
	M	11.4		
32. Little emphasis on what youth do after	T	22.9	35.3	
	F	67.1	64.7	
	M	10.0		
33. Discussions emphasize understanding persons	R	71.4	66.5	
	F	12.9	33.5	
	M	14.3		
34. MYC well-organized unit	T	37.5	67.6	y+
	F	50.0	31.2	
	M	14.3		
35. Staff are always changing minds	T	32.9	65.9	y+
	F	48.6	34.1	
	M	18.6		
36. Decisions about Center made by staff	T	42.9	68.8	y+
	F	44.3	31.2	
	M	12.9		
37. Youth put a lot of energy in what they do	T	38.6	60.1	y+
	F	44.3	39.9	
	M	17.1		
38. Youth rarely help each other	T	20.0	30.6	y+
	F	67.1	69.4	
	M	12.9		
39. Youth say anything to counselors	T	14.3	10.4	y+
	F	72.9	89.6	
	M	12.9		

		<u>Staff</u>	<u>Youth</u>	
40. Staff discourages criticism	T	38.6	50.9	y+
	F	48.6	48.6	
	M	12.9		
41. Care more about feelings than personal	T	60.0	40.5	s+
	F	28.6	59.0	
	M	11.4		
42. Staff interested in learning about feelings	T	34.3	43.9	y+
	F	55.7	55.5	
	M	10.0		
43. Things disorganized around here	T	67.1	75.1	y+
	F	22.9	24.9	
	M	10.0		
44. Staff tell youth when they are doing well	T	81.4	84.4	
	F	7.1	15.6	
	M	11.4		
45. Youth rarely punished	T	24.3	22.0	y+
	F	65.7	78.0	
	M	10.0		
46. MYC has very little social activities	T	40.0	34.1	y+
	F	51.4	65.9	
	M	8.6		
47. Staff go out of way to help youth	T	68.6	59.0	s+
	F	18.6	41.0	
	M	12.9		
48. Youth careful what they say	T	77.1	93.1	y+
	F	14.3	6.9	
	M	8.6		
49. Youth encouraged to start their own activities	T	64.3	68.8	
	F	22.9	31.2	
	M	12.9		
50. MYC emphasizes job training	T	65.7	50.9	s+
	F	22.9	49	
	M	11.4		

Youth rated their behavior higher than the trackers on the Unobtrusive, Responsibility, Considerateness, Rapport, Insight and Conformity scales. The trackers gave higher ratings on the Friendliness scale. Both groups had approximately the same mean scores on the Independence, Enthusiasm, Sociability, Communication, Social Control, Anger Control and Calmness Scales. Youth's self ratings are probably influenced by response set and tend to see themselves in a more favorable light.

LEVEL OF IMPLEMENTATION

The essential component of Reality therapy is the relationship and the involvement of that relationship. The cottages were rated on seven dimensions of Reality therapy:

1. Use of discipline steps
2. Use of Trackers to work individually with youth to develop positive goals
3. Use of Point System
4. Use of groups
5. Use of Plans
6. Use of Responsibility
7. Staff Commitment

The trainer rated each of the cottages on the seven dimensions and also added an eighth category, miscellaneous. Her ratings are presented in Table 20. Analysis indicates that there are differences in where each treatment unit or cottage is on implementing Reality Therapy.

In analyzing the results of the youth testing, by level of implementation, where cottages are ranked high, medium, or low implementers, the analysis by scale yields mixed results. Cottage 4

TABLE 20

COTTAGE IMPLEMENTATION

Cottage 1

1. Using time out/isolation area as an integral part of their program since November 1979.
2. Using trackers to work individually with boys to develop positive goals.
3. Point system is still "standard" with more emphasis on losing points than earning points.
4. Groups are a large part of their program. Recent shifts are more in line with R. T. with student involvement and problem solving.
5. Plans - Developing long term goals, and have instituted daily plans in their reflection hour period. Not certain how effectively the staff does follow-up on boy's plan.
6. Responsibility - They have implemented a self-evaluation program which is working quite well. They have various student committees to put more responsibility on the boys.
7. Staff - One person is involved in training for trainers. Staff scored highest on grounds on R. T. knowledge test.
8. Misc. - The cottage stresses involvement/community. This is, by far, their strongest area.

Cottage 2

1. Using disciplinary steps pretty thoroughly in the past month as a result of a program change and extra training. Now using plans a lot more.
2. Trackers are being used with individual boys but not very effectively in most cases at this time due to lack of regularity.
3. Point system - Just changed to a positive/earned point system. Too soon to see any results.
4. Groups - Staff have just been trained in doing R. T. in groups and are doing groups on a random basis. Much improvement still needed in this area.
5. Plans - They are now well trained in plan writing and are using long term and daily plans in the program. Follow up is weak, however.
6. Responsibility - They had a student ranking group system which did not work well. They have made some recent dramatic changes, but are still very weak in this area.
7. Staff - Three persons are in training for trainers. Each staff person has been involved in individual consultation with me and have developed plans to further implement R. T. They presently have 2 "spares" in the cottage, so continuity has been a problem, but is much improved in the last 30 days. It still depends too much upon who is on duty.
8. Misc. - I spent two weeks in their program for consultation last month giving them specific directions, feedback, and training. Results should show up on later data collections.

Cottage 3

1. Disciplinary steps - They are shaky in this area, but I have recently worked with them to use the program. There is some evidence that they are beginning to do so.
2. Trackers - They presently have trackers assigned as of 4 Nov 80. I do not know how effectively they are using their trackers. Addressing positive goals is a weakness of their present program.
3. Point system - Using "standard" negative system. Beginning to use it less punitively, but is a weak area.
4. Groups - They have not done much in this area in terms of R.T. (The staff did receive some training in Oct 80). They have a couple of substance abuse groups going. This area is also quite weak in the program - the overall lack of group counseling.
5. Plans - Has been a very weak area. I have just finished working with them to address this issue. Some of the staff began implementing daily plans within the last month on a random basis.
6. Responsibility - The present program does use the student ranked groups, which is working pretty well. In other aspects of the program they are weak in this area, but showing signs of improvement. Most of the staff are still into control and the more typical correctional approach.
7. Staff - Two persons involved in training for trainers. They are slowly responding to training overall, but lag behind most other cottages. Have spent time in individual consultations with staff to develop plans to implement the program more extensively.
8. Misc. - The student ranked groups are working well. All other areas are weak, with some small signs of improvement.

Cottage 4

1. Disciplinary steps - They are using the disciplinary steps pretty effectively.
2. Trackers - They are using tracking somewhat. What they are doing seems pretty effective.
3. Point system - They are using the "standard" point system. The environment seems to be fairly non-punitive, but there is still some evidence of reverting to "control" when the chips are down.
4. Groups - They have several groups going on which deal with problem solving, positive plans, life skills, etc.
5. Plans - Using long range plans very well. Have adapted short term plans into group format.
6. Responsibility - They are using the student ranked groups very effectively. They are working with the older boys and seem to be open to creating as many situations as possible for the boys to take responsibility. In this respect, its one of their strongest areas.
7. Staff - One person in training for trainers. They work together pretty well and are using a variety of positive approaches. They seem, overall, to be attempting to implement R. T. as much as they can.

Cottage 4 cont.

8. Misc. - This seems to be one of the best programs on grounds in terms of R. T. implementation. They are teaching life skills in their program and tend to approach the boys as adults, rather than children. There seems to be a lot of involvement built into the program. The boys have a lot of input into the groups, etc.

Cottage 6

1. Disciplinary steps - Implemented steps approximately Nov 79 and have continued using and refining the process. They seem to have a pretty good handle on this area.
2. Trackers - Using tracking system to some extent. I am not sure how effectively.
3. Point system - Since Jan 80 they have been using a positive/earned point system. It seems to be working well.
4. Groups - Have had regular groups since I arrived. Some staff, other than Unit Director, are doing groups - basically discussion/problem solving. Seem to be effective, but I can't personally attest to what they are doing.
5. Plans - Have been using plans for some disciplinary actions since Jan 80. Beginning to use plans more consistently. Not sure what they do toward positive planning.
6. Responsibility - The groups deal with issues of responsibility. How much responsibility they are given depends upon what staff are on duty.
7. Staff - Two persons in training for trainers. The staff appears to be about half committed to R. T. Some are doing it and some are marginal.
8. Misc. - This program has the youngest boys which has an impact on results. Maturity level is very low.

Cottage 7

1. Disciplinary steps - Used somewhat but more in punitive mode than teaching mode.
2. Trackers - Not really used because its a hold for court cottage.
3. Point system - Standard point system - lose points rather than earn them.
4. Groups - Minimal. Tend more toward babysitting.
5. Plans - Used to some extent in disciplinary issues. Not used much in positive planning.
6. Responsibility - Hard to assess, but appears minimal. Too much controlling, directing - babysitting approach. Essentially staff have a give up attitude that they can't do anything to help the students held for court since they are there such a short time.
7. Staff - One person in training for trainers. Minimal application of R. T., but they are getting better, I think.
8. Misc. - Very little programming because its hold for court cottage. Most boys are there for only a few weeks.

Cottage 8

1. Disciplinary steps - Implemented fairly well, using plans to improve, using room control, etc. Have recently begun increased implementation.
2. Trackers - Have had trackers through entire program. Used fairly effectively by most cottage staff.
3. Point system - Standard Point system which is a punitive system. They have used alternative approaches with specific students.
4. Groups - Conducting daily goal development groups, substance abuse groups and provide additional groups with volunteers and staff.
5. Plans - Using positive planning well, including daily plans. Follow up is also improving.
6. Responsibility - Still some controlling but increasingly using techniques to hold students accountable. Students have some input in making rules, etc.
7. Staff - Two persons in training for trainers. Staff responding well to R. T. training and most are implementing very well.
8. Misc. - This is the girls unit, hence, all programs are in one building, i.e., security, ICY, open program hold for court, special treatment, etc. This creates unique problems for the unit.

H Security Treatment Unit (formerly Cottage 9)

1. Disciplinary steps - Used somewhat but mostly for extreme situations to remove student from program.
2. Trackers - Have assigned trackers who work individually with the boys.
3. Point system - They have an earned point system in a two-phase program. Its designed by time periods and points are earned for each period. Its essentially a behavior modification point system, however.
4. Groups - I am not really sure, but I think they have very few.
5. Plans - Developing release goals and phase goals with the students. Similar to Hayden in their short term goal program.
6. Responsibility - Still retain a "correctional" approach, being told what to do, but I think its improving somewhat.
7. Staff - One person in training for trainers. They are a unique group, specially selected for this unit. They are very much involved with the students. They also seem to have only a minimal commitment to R. T.
8. Misc. - The program is a security program - the students are locked in 24 hours a day. Its designed to be a 6 week program for boys who flagrantly violated the open program. There are no more than 15 boys in the unit which creates a great deal of individualized attention.

Hayden Unit

1. Disciplinary steps - Using steps fairly well including isolation and room control. They have been using the system for at least a year now and have a good handle on it.
2. Trackers - Very good system with a great deal of individual contact.

Hayden Unit cont.

3. Point system - Positive, earned point system designed in time periods. Essentially, its a behavior modification point system, however.
4. Groups - Daily groups led by students. Use some elements of R. T. in groups but need improvement in this aspect.
5. Plans - Well developed system for long term, intermediate and short term goals and plans. This is a strong area of their program.
6. Responsibility - Students are given responsibility and have input into their programs. They put a lot of energy into developing responsibility. It varies a great deal, however, among the staff.
7. Staff - Two persons in training for trainers. The staff is overall a very fine group. They also have excellent supervision and work well together.
8. Misc. - This is a special treatment unit for emotionally disturbed students. They have 11 students in the unit which chreates high levels of involvement with staff. They also deal with many of the most difficult to work with students. They have a family-type unit which is very responsive to the needs of their clients.

the Hayden Unit, and Cottage 9, the girls' unit, were rated high implementers. Cottages 3, 7, and 8 were rated low implementers, the others medium. The female unit tends to be more external in orientation and have lower self-concepts. Unit 4 tends to have more internal orientation and more positive self-concept. Cottage 4 also reports high schial control on the Jesness. There is no consistent pattern where units with the highest implementation level tend to have the more positive scores on the various scales. On some of the scales, the cottages ranked low implementers scored the highest or more positive.

It should be noted, however, that the youth were not tested at the beginning and end of treatment, but all within a unit at a given period in time. The length of stay within each unit of each individual would vary. The degree of exposure to dimensions of Reality Therapy would vary.

There are differences on the items of the Correctional Institution Environment Scale which tend to support the differences in implementation more than the other used in the assessment. For example, there are differences between the cottages and staff in their perceptions of personal-problem orientation and practical-problem orientation (see Table 17).

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

There are some of the findings related to the Reality Therapy Program at the Maine Youth Center, based upon this and previous reports and studies. This report focuses on the impact of the program on the youth, not staff.

1. The youth are reporting that they are attempting to follow the steps of reality therapy. Fewer individuals each time period report that they have not tried the process.

2. The youth tend to report the affective dimensions of their social behavior toward the positive end of the scale. They view themselves as acting more responsible, having greater control of their anger, being more sociable, etc. Students attempting to follow the steps of reality therapy report themselves as having more positive social behaviors.

3. There appears to be a wide range of attitudes that youth have toward themselves and how they perceive their locus of control. Students who are more internally oriented tend to have more positive self-esteem.

4. Youth tend to show a much higher need and desire for affection - the need for a loving and affectionate relationship with others and control of the behavior of decision-making with others. Reality therapy stressed the importance of these dimensions in the interaction between staff and youth and in the implementation process of making changes in behavior.

5. The perceptions of the correction environment have changed over time. Dimensions of Involvement of youth in the center vary. They tend to be prouder of the center but not always assume responsibility for their involvement with their peers. They perceive more involvement by the staff but the youth feel that they are not as open to express themselves freely or openly. They report that they have more responsibility but the parameters of their decision-making is more limited. They say that they are encouraged to take leadership but have less voice in providing the staff suggestions. There has been more emphasis on Practical Orientation, i.e., making plans for when they are out of the center. There has been more attention on looking at the personal problems of the youth. The youth are more positive now about the order and organization of the unit. They do see some indications of lack of clarity of the actions by the staff. The system is perceived as having greater staff control than before.

6. There are cottage differences in the degree of implementation of Reality Therapy. The differences have been identified by the ratings by the trainer. The self-ratings by youth, in part, reflect these differences but do not in all cases reflect the level of Reality Therapy being utilized in each cottage. There are other factors which might influence the self report of youth such as age, length of stay, sex and educational level as well as different aspects of response set.

The differences among cottages in how the youth evaluate their behavior, accept the responsibilities for their decisions,

make friends with peers and understand and recognize their values more directly reflect the differences in how Reality Therapy is implemented in the cottages.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Attention needs to be directed toward evaluating the impact of Reality Therapy on the school unit.

2. Since self-report inventories are influenced by social desirability and other response set problems, other types of documentation should be systematically collected such as unobtrusive date, rating by others, and ethnicgraphic procedures.

3. The evaluation procedure of testing youth within a couple of weeks of their arrival and follow-up four to five months later should be implemented. They should also be tracked after their release.

4. The cottage and school staff should be provided a profile of the scores which would include the individual's profile, the cottage profile, and the profile for the total center.

5. Separate analysis should be conducted for male and female groups. There appears to be significant sex differences on several of the instruments utilized.

6. Staff testing should be coordinated with youth testing so that comparisons can be made at the same time period.

7. The evaluation utilizes the immediate criterion of the behavior of the youth within the correctional environment. Intermediate criteria such as how youth at certain intervals do after their release needs to be incorporated in the design. The ultimate criterion of the type of citizens they eventually become is of the most importnace but is hard to assess in a short period of time.

Bibliography

Cattell, R. B., and Eber, H. W. Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire. Champaign, Ill.: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing, 1967.

Coopersmith, S. The Antecedents of Self-Esteem. San Francisco: W.H. Freeman, 1967.

* Drummond, R. J. Reality Therapy Activities Questionnaire. Orono, Me.: College of Education, 1980.

Glasser, W. Reality Therapy. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.

Jesness, C. F. Jesness Behavior Checklist. Palo Alto, Cal.: Consulting Psychological Press, 1970.

Moos, R. H. Correctional Institutions Environment Scale. Palo Alto, Cal.: Consulting Psychological Press, 1974.

Nie, N. H., Hull, C. H., Jenkins, J. G., Steinbrenner, K., and Brent, D. H. SPSS Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. Second Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Nowicki, S., and Strickland, B. R. A Locus of Control Scale for Children. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1973, 40, 148-151.

Schutz, W., Firo, B. Palo Alto, Cal.: Consulting Psychological Press, 1977.